

REMARKS

The amendment to the paragraph on page 6 is being made to correct a reference number.

Applicant notes with appreciation the indication that claims 7, 10 – 13 and 15 are allowable, claims 7, 10 and 15 being rewritten in independent form as claims 24, 25 and 26 to include the limitations of the claims from which they depended. Accordingly, claims 24 – 26 and claims 11-13 are believed to be allowable.

As to claim 1, line 16 as originally filed, the term “fasteners” is set forth as a positive member as part of the clamp and thus it is not understood the basis indicating there is insufficient antecedent basis. Claim 21 has been amended to provide an antecedent basis for “recesses”.

Reconsideration of the other claims now present in the application is requested since it is believed no one reference or proper combination of references would make it obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the structure as claimed for reasons set forth hereinafter.

Claim 1 and the claims which depend therefrom are believed to be allowable in that claim 1 contains limitations to a block having a channel extending the longitudinal length of the block for having the cable or rope extending therein the longitudinal length of block. With reference to Reed, Jr., it is respectfully submitted that the movable portion 14 does not suggest providing a channel that extends the longitudinal length of the movable portion 14 in that as may be seen from Figure 4 there is no structure extending longitudinally between the edges 53 of longitudinally adjacent fingers 56 and the end fingers which have end surfaces 49 to provide longitudinal channel portions extending longitudinally across cut out portions 46. That is, there is no structure extending away from the cut out surfaces of portions 46 that extends away from side 45 to define

longitudinal parts of a channel. The combined longitudinal lengths of the cut out portions is over 30 percent of the longitudinal length of movable portion 14. In fact it is suggested that Reed teaches away from providing a longitudinal channel for having a rope or cable extended therein the length of the movable portion in that as may be seen in Figure 2 of Reed the cables 18 are clamped to extend transversely of the length of movable portion 14 and do not extend in a longitudinal channel such as claimed.

It is believed the reference Reed has been selected and applied in a manner that purports to anticipate claim is based on what is claimed rather than based on suggestions in Reed which it is submitted is improper. With reference thereto, as may be seen from Figure 2 the stationary part 12 is mounted to supporting structure and thus it is submitted would normally be considered the base of the Reed assembly rather than a cover as set forth in the Office Action.

Claims 2 and 9 are additionally believed to be allowable in that it contains a limitation to the ridge extending substantially the length of the channel. As may be seen from Figure 7 of Reed the middle finger layer 24 does not extend the substantial length of the stationary part 12 and it is submitted teaches away from doing so since it would limit or preclude there being an area for the cable to extend into in a manner taught by Reed.

Claim 21 and the claims which depend therefrom are believed to be allowable in that claim 21 contains limitations to a block having a generally planar bottom surface and a longitudinally elongated channel and a cover having an elongated rigid extendable into the channel with there being horizontally elongated chisel point ridge portions dependingly joined to the block bottom surface and one of the ridge portions extending at an angle 180 degrees relative to another of the

edge portions. Beatty discloses an insulator for clamping a wire that includes a base section having four conical projections 15 which it is submitted does not suggest providing a horizontally elongated chisel ridge portion. Applicant has found that conical projections on the clamp base do not provide sufficient surface area to prevent undesirable movement of the clamp after the cable has been mounted to supporting structure such as a wall. It is noted that in the Office Action, member 14 of Reed has been considered a base which in Reed is not mounted to supporting structure such as a wall. Further, it is believed there is no suggestion in Reed or Beatty of providing elongated chisel point ridge portions on the bottom surface, let alone having such ridge portions extending at different angles.


Claims 3 – 5 are additionally believed to allowable for reasons similar to those set forth for the allowance of claim 21.

Claims 6 and 20 are additionally believed to be allowable in that, for example, claim 6 recites “the flange inturned portions having transversely adjacent ends joined to one another and having downwardly opening slots with top transverse edges at about the elevation as the adjacent ridge end portion”. As may be seen from Figure 3 of Reed, the member 12 does not have flanges with inturned portions that have slots such as set forth in these claims. With the claimed slots, the cable or rope extending therethrough is not undesirably bent when extending in the base channel and longitudinally outwardly thereof and the cover is mounted to the base to clamp the cable. It is not seen there is anything in Reed to suggest providing such structure and accordingly claims 6 and 20 are believed to be allowable.

The claims now present in the application are believed to be in condition for allowance and an early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

A check in the amount of \$200.00 as the extra claim fee is submitted herewith.

Respectfully submitted,



Clayton R. Johnson
Reg. No. 19,244

My File J63.202
Phone 952-926-6939

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence or fee is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commission for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexander, VA 22313-1450 on April 26, 2005.

CLAYTON R. JOHNSON (person mailing paper or fee)



April 26, 2005